DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 667 EA 024 797

AUTHOR Weise, Kay R.
TITLE Through the Lens of Human Resource Development: A Fresh Look at Professional Preparation Programs.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Minneapolis, MN, October 30-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Principals; Program Effectiveness; Teacher Education Programs; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Principals Reflective Experiential Prep Prog TX; *University of Houston TX

ABSTRACT

With the national focus on school improvement, universities are being asked to reevaluate graduate educational administration programs. In 1988, the University of Houston's Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies (ELCS) implemented a pilot program to experiment with a number of reform strategies. The Principals' Reflective, Experiential Preparation (PREP) program was a highly personalized, self-paced curriculum driven by diagnostic assessment data that identified individual values, beliefs, preferences, abilities, behaviors, and styles. This report examines the relationship between theory and real-life conditions in the PREP program. Document analysis and interviews with 29 people examined key program elements: philosophy and goals, nomination and selection, diagnostic assessment, individualized education plans, nontraditional course offerings, supplemental seminars, internships, mentorship, reflective practice, and cohort groups. Several changes were identified to facilitate reform in administrator education programs. Reform will require major policy changes, advance planning, cohort group utilization, innovation and tradition integration, a "school-within-a-school" approach, personalization, evaluation, cost-benefit analyses, power and authority realignment, collaboration, leadership and personal profiles, adult learning theory, and mentor programs. An outline of the PREP program is provided in an appendix. (Contains 23 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355667

THROUGH THE LENS OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: A FRESH LOOK AT PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Kay R. Weise

University of Houston

Paper presented at the UCEA Convention '92, "Dealing with Diversity: Creating Schools That Work For All Children," Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 29-November 1, 1992.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Weise

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG024797

Through the Lens of Human Resource Development: A Fresh Look at Professional Preparation Programs

Introduction

Long ago among the porticoes of the Lyceum, according to legend, one of Aristotle's' students asked him a simple question: "Of all the things you have learned, what was the most difficult for you to understand?" Hesitating only a moment, the mentor answered, "Myself." A rather startling reply from the philosopher/scholar who taught and wrote about every branch of knowledge existing in his time -- a man esteemed throughout the ages as one of the most learned men the world has ever known. If a man of Aristotle's insight, logic, and intelligence found self-knowledge the most challenging of all intellectual pursuits, what might we infer about the rest of us mortals? Further, for our purposes here, what might we reasonably speculate about the influence, if any, of self-knowledge in acquiring broader bases of understanding human interaction? Might today's educators profit from exploring whether or not self-understanding bears implications for other learnings -- and if so, what kinds, and to what extent?

The University of Houston was addressing these questions in 1988, when the Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies (ELCS) implemented a research-based pilot program partially supported by the Danforth Foundation. With the national focus on school improvement, leaders of current educational reform are calling upon universities to reevaluate graduate programs that certify school administrators. Universities *are* rethinking traditional approaches; however, effecting change in such a long-established institution requires complex, arduous effort as well as unqualified commitment from every key player in the process. The ELCS faculty made a bold contribution to university renewal efforts by stepping outside the boundaries of tradition to experiment with a number of

strategies that critics have proposed as viable solutions for perceived problems in preparation programs.

Purpose of the Study

This paper presents results of a recent study of the University of Houston's pilot, the Principals' Reflective, Experiential Preparation (PREP) Program. The investigation analyzed specific features of this program through the eyes of actual participants, both learners and learning facilitators, thereby creating a vicarious opportunity for policy makers to observe the full dynamics of certain strategies endorsed by proponents of field-based administrator training. Program facilitators sought to create a highly personalized, self-paced curriculum driven by diagnostic assessment data that identified individual values, beliefs, preferences, abilities, behaviors, and styles. It embodied, to say the least, a dramatic departure from "business as usual" -- one that tested the mettle of students and faculty alike.

Drawing from a review of current educational reform literature, the study focuses on the interplay between ideas and real life conditions, between espoused theory and enacted theory, as the PREP Program unfolded at the University of Houston. Findings yield thought-provoking information about how "purely" the underlying ideas translated into practice, how closely the reality resembled the vision, and how diversely program participants responded to the change process. Analysis of those findings does not offer a panacea, nor does it furnish a "recipe" to correct the deficiencies of current practices. Rather, it aims at helping others gain insight from the experience without paying the usual price. Taken in that vein, perhaps it could serve as a guide to circumvent a common pitfall of new enterprise, i.e., "re-inventing the wheel." To frame this presentation, I will emphasize elements of the program that centered on individual student learning needs and programmatic efforts to promote self-awareness and personal growth.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the design and execution of the study:

1. How was the idea of Danforth Program for Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) generated? What influences brought to bear on the Foundation's selection of this particular approach?

2. How did the University of Houston translate the Danforth Foundation's vision into a vision for its Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies (ELCS)?

3. What expectations did the UH faculty (especially facilitators) hold? Why did they want to participate in this project? What personal needs, if any, did the project "fit?"

4. How did the program "fit" the ELCS Department in terms of its resources? its organizational structure? its mission and philosophy?

5. How did the program "fit" participating school districts in terms of their resources? organizational structure? mission and philosophy?

6. What happened to the "vision" when the program reached implementation phase, involving school districts and the first group of Scholars?

Data Sources.

Data were collected through the use of a semistructured interview (McCracken, 1988) and document analysis (Bernard, 1988). Interview schedules were constructed to encompass all participant perspectives: the Danforth Foundation, University of Houston program facilitators, steering committee, university mentors (ELCS faculty), and field mentors. Twenty-nine informants were interviewed, including the former Danforth Foundation Program Director, ten ELCS faculty members, 14 students, and four district administrators. Interview questions were designed to elicit their perceptions of the following key program elements: 1) philosophy and goals; 2) nomination and selection; 3) diagnostic

assessment; 4) individualized educational plans; 5) non-traditional course offerings; 6) supplemental seminars; 7) internship; 8) mentorship; 9) reflective practice; and 10) the cohort group. Curriculum plans and program events were traced through primary documents, which included the following: meeting minutes; written program plans; correspondence with school districts, students, faculty, and mentors; seminar agendas; Danforth resource materials; and various curriculum projects produced by students during implementation.

Method

The investigation was a *hybrid* study that delivered both a historical-chronological record of events and a qualitative-ethnographic analysis that helped to explain why events occurred as they did (Carspecken & Apple, 1992). For historical data, interviewees were selected by a combination of methods. All Danforth Scholars were interviewed, except one who declined the invitation. Professors, mentors, and steering committee members were selected by purposive sampling, with informants emerging as information accumulated (to the point of redundancy). Triangulation of data from program documents (meeting minutes, program descriptions, seminar agendas, IEP's, correspondence, etc.) and from semistructured interviews was used to reconstruct the program's implementation at the University of Houston. Interview content centered on participants' personal experiences, especially in terms of how program goals and innovations fit, or failed to fit, personal and organizational structures. The technique for interviews consisted primarily of open-ended questions (McCracken, 1988). Information from interviews was validated against primary documents from the program.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed through domain and thematic procedures (Spradley, 1979). Results of the analysis were then studied in light of three issues: 1) characteristics of organizational structures through which a program must be

implemented; 2) how those structures relate to human motivational factors, and 3) more general cultural meanings within education and beyond. Though a number of theoretical underpinnings provided direction, the study does not rest on a single *a priori* theory. Data were collected and analyzed qualitatively to identify patterns from which theory may emerge. Because of the emergent design, findings could not be predicted until the investigation was well underway (Lincoln and Guba, pp.39-43). Finally, the analysis of the University of Houston program has been used to generate hypotheses about programs of this type in general.

Scope and Limitations

The present study documents only the University of Houston PREP Program, one of sixteen pilots sponsored by the Danforth Foundation. While this program resembled those initiated by other institutions in the national consortium, the researcher did not attempt to generalize beyond its implementation. The study does not intend to generalize; its purpose is to reconstruct events as a case study of circumstances surrounding one university's attempt to alter delivery of a program steeped in tradition. In the process, however, the investigator searched the findings to produce general hypotheses that other studies might pursue with further inquiry, especially with regard to personalization of instruction.

Significance of the Study

Leaders in the field of educational administration are making a clear and specific call for reforming preparation programs to produce visionary school principals. Despite general agreement about the "ingredients" of visionary leadership, little has been done to integrate them into the university curriculum for principal certification. The Danforth Foundation initiated a movement in that direction by establishing the DPPSP. The rationale is strong and simple; the need for change is overwhelmingly clear. However, viable methods of effecting this

magnitude of change remain neither simple nor clear because so few institutions have actually implemented complete programs dedicated to the concept.

Those few, then, have an opportunity (if not an obligation) to prepare the way for others, or perhaps to forewarn others, by recording what happened when they attempted to transform the vision into reality. Some of the best minds in the profession have contributed to this vision of educational administration, the changes they want to see, and a host of specific ideas about how to achieve them. What happens, however, when those ideas are activated in the real world?

Implications

The tide of educational reform gains momentum almost daily, and professional leaders have suggested a plethora of remedies in response to admonitions. Many of them seem logical, even obvious, ways to improve current practices; however, their feasibility can be tested only by putting them into action. The DPPSP promoted innovative strategies that appeared to address the most common issues related to the principalship. The Foundation provided a support system for experimentation, an arena for testing remedies suggested by leaders in the field. It seems incumbent upon participating universities to document issues and events--especially unanticipated ones--that emerged as they transformed abstract ideas into concrete actions.

Though the University of Houston has been financially unable to retain the program in its original form, the ELCS faculty, in its continuous effort to improve the Administration and Supervision Program, has already adapted certain PREP program components into graduate studiesfor all students. Thus the pilot assumes a new dimension: if not a model to be institutionalized in its entirety, at least a documented experience in implementing strategies highly recommended but heretofore largely untested.

National Background

The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, *Leaders for America's Schools* (Griffiths & Forsythe, 1988), typifies the outcry for blanket reform of public schools. Among the most frequent targets of criticism is the quality of leadership (more accurately, lack of it) of the campus principal. The entire educational community has been called upon to improve the character of leadership in public schools--to change everything from the definition of the principalship to the recruitment and training of candidates. Departments of educational administration have received scathing indictments for embracing mediocre standards and delivering programs that are lenient, incoherent, and ill-suited to prepare candidates for effective leadership (Murphy, 1990).

Paving the way for such criticism, Effective Schools Research introduced a profile of the effective principal as an instructional leader whose vision of excellence permeates every dimension of a school's character (Brookover et al, 1979; Edmonds and Fredrickson, 1978; Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy, 1980; Rutherford, 1985; Rutter et al, 1979). The movement has gained so much momentum that universities are receiving considerable pressure to redesign certification programs to produce graduates ready to practice "visionary leadership."

The Danforth Foundation Initiative

In 1986, the Danforth Foundation issued a position paper and accompanying invitation to universities interested in examining alternatives that might address these new leadership issues. Specifically, they created the DPPSP as a source of seed money for universities wishing to explore innovative certification programs. The Foundation offered grants supporting firm commitments to design "...the experiences and programs necessary for the candidates to achieve an advanced

degree and certification for the principalship through non-traditional means" (Danforth Foundation, 1986, p.5).

In formulating a program philosophy, the Foundation's Program Director explored common practices most often cited as illogical ways to produce outstanding practitioners. The program sought to modify or eliminate at least four such targets of criticism: self-selection of principal candidates; their isolation in the university setting during graduate studies; sole reliance on university professors for determining and delivering curriculum; and exclusive use of lecture/textbook methods, as opposed to field-based experience. To this end, the Foundation stipulated that participating universities embrace certain program objectives, which the position paper articulated as follows:

- To identify and encourage able persons to become candidates for the principalship early in their educational careers
- To provide an opportunity for university personnel and practicing school administrators to work together in the preparation of highly competent school principals
- To develop learning experiences for principal candidates utilizing schools, the university, and community organizations as the learning environment
- To identify and organize learning experiences that require collaborative teaching efforts of university faculty, school district personnel, and community members
- To prepare principals with emphasis on experiential learning which allows them to demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge traditionally expected for the position of principal and to demonstrate competency in schools and the community beyond those commonly expressed in schools of today(Danforth, 1986, p. 3).

University of Houston Pilot Program

The following year, the University of Houston received a grant to participate in the DPPSP, which had by then evolved into a national consortium of universities attempting some rather drastic changes in principal certification curriculum. Each member university developed a curriculum unique to its particular needs; therefore, while a few key elements emerged in most of the programs, these pilot efforts varied considerably in both content and delivery.

Philosophy and Goals

At the national level, the Danforth Foundation articulated clear and specific long-range goals in designing the DPPSP. These goals embraced a philosophy centered on developing visionary school leaders through active, ongoing collaboration between universities and local districts. The character of the Danforth mission attracted interest from professors of educational administration who shared not only the vision of a new breed of creative administrators but also the eagerness to explore alternatives for selecting and training candidates. Despite a genuine commitment to the vision, however, participating universities were expected to meet certain Foundation requirements that may or may not have been feasible, or at least realistic, especially in terms of the time frame stipulated for implementation.

The University of Houston's program reflected a two-pronged notion of leadership development: educating students about the nature of leadership and helping them to reach a deeper self-understanding, which many consider the sine qua non of an effective leader. These two goals shaped the philosophical base for designing a program to enhance students' capacities for visionary leadership. The term *vision* in this context, simply stated, means a clear, compelling picture of the ideal organization and how it should function. The PREP curriculum grew from a philosophy that excellent school leaders must command not only a thorough

understanding of the leader's role, but also a strong personal sense of how best to accomplish a vision of excellence.

There seemed to be little question that the ELCS Department mission and philosophy supported concepts promoted by the national program; however, the time frame for participating universities to design and implement the program allowed little opportunity to develop a sense of ownership at the local level, for either university faculty or district superintendents. For example, some professors who could have been key players indicated that they had no awareness of the program until they were asked to take part in the first planning session. In addition, the level of commitment among faculty varied a great deal, ranging from genuine dedication to little or no interest in the concept.

In spite of these constraints, many of which were beyond the university's control, the program generated frequent dialogues about philosophical issues in school administration. Many participants noted the value of exchanging ideas within the framework of uncharted territory and learning from each other in the process. Without exception, informants from all groups endorsed the underlying philosophy and program goals. Even students who withdrew from the program before completion continued to support the concept.

Program Components

The concept of integrating personal force with appropriate knowledge and skills guided decisions for developing a plan that revamped nearly every feature of current practice. The following summary provides the research-based rationale and a brief description of these departures from tradition, along with the outcomes revealed in this study.

Selection Process

Studies of recruitment and selection of potential leaders reveal procedures that are usually informal and haphazard. Candidates are most often self-selected,

and leadership recruitment programs are extremely rare. A number of reform advocates recommend that universities establish local district programs to identify potential leaders and provide incentives for them to enter challenging programs (Griffiths, 1988; NCEEA, 1987; Goodlad, 1984).

Objectives. PREP Program facilitators addressed the issues above by developing written standards and procedures that framed a quality-driven process. District superintendents received an overview of the program, accompanied by an annotated list of specific selection criteria (see Appendix) to guide the nomination of students by district administrators. After nominations were approved by the Steering Committee, Danforth Scholars were to undergo an extensive battery of assessments to ascertain learning and personality styles as well as entry-level administrative skills.

Outcomes. The selection process evolved somewhat differently than facilitators had envisioned. When district administrators resisted the notion of limiting student eligibility strictly to classroom teachers with no administrative experience, the steering committee created additional options to include novice administrators. One Scholar had even completed mid-management certification before placement in the program. Entry levels of the other students ranged from no graduate studies in administration to substantial progress in the certification requirements. This wide variance complicated the design of common curricular experiences for the entire cohort, especially since many of the facilitators' early proposals targeted candidates with no administrative experience or graduate course work.

In addition, only two of the districts were willing to relinquish traditional selection prerogatives and yield to open application with specific criteria, even though all the districts participated in establishing the criteria. As a result, the issue of self-selection, cited as a key deficiency in the professional literature, was

addressed by only half of the district nominations. However, one of the facilitators indicated considerable surprise that in spite of some districts' insistence on maintaining the status quo, he could not have expected a higher caliber of Scholars (by his standards) than those who entered the program. This observation may raise an important question about the "evils" of self-selection so often mentioned by advocates of reform.

The nomination and selection process varied substantially among participating districts. Some districts made no distinction between nomination and selection; they simply selected students. In some cases, candidates who were already being considered for a specific position were selected so they could receive extra training. Nominees from other districts often had no idea why they were selected. One Scholar even recalled that his principal simply appeared at his door and more or less informed him that he was going to participate. Only two districts required candidates to apply for nomination. One of these carried out an elaborate process, with as many as a hundred nominations; however, they added some rather stringent criteria and procedures (an additional position paper and an interview) to the ones established for the program. Diversity of procedures among participating districts prevented any meaningful evaluation of the process.

Diagnostic assessments began as soon as the first group of students was selected. This process included the following assessments: 1) the NASSP Assessment Center, 2) the Kolb Learning Styles Inventory, 3) the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory, 4) the Work Values Inventory, and 5) the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, and 6) the Hall-Tonna Values Inventory.

Diagnostic-prescriptive Curriculum.

Data from the entry assessments were to be used in preparing an Individual Educational Plan for each Danforth Scholar. Students were to collaborate with both field mentors and university mentors in setting goals and objectives to meet

identified needs. The process focused on self-awareness as well as development of individual potential.

Objectives. The action plan adopted by the Board of Directors called for a differentiated curriculum articulated in the Program Overview as follows:

> [The] pilot program marks a dramatic departure from the current certification program, which requires a given number of semester credit hours of traditional, predominantly lecture-oriented course work. Students participating in this program will receive University credit and Mid-management certification; however, the curriculum will consist substantially of reflective, field-based administrative experience as specified in an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) designed for each student. Additional curriculum will be addressed as much as possible through other types of experiential learning, e.g., laboratories, simulations, etc. Each IEP will contain specific competencies identified through extensive diagnostic/prescriptive assessment by the University. Learning experiences will be self-paced, allowing students to complete requirements at any time within the two-year period (p.2).

Outcomes. Plans for curriculum development unfolded logically with sustained emphasis on individualization through the IEP, a concept that was strongly supported by both students and faculty. As implementation proceeded, however, several key issues emerged for which neither party could find quick or easy solutions.

Probably the most difficult hurdle for individualization was the issue of accommodating personal goals and objectives within the parameters of traditional course credit. Had time allowed for proper development of the content modules proposed and endorsed by the faculty, that issue might have taken on a different complexion (though it probably would not have been entirely resolved). However,

under the circumstances of simultaneous planning and implementation, logistics presented a very real dilemma. Professors had to continue meeting their obligations to the university system for awarding credit, while students faced the difficulty of continually proposing projects and activities that, by nature, did not fit within those parameters. Furthermore, there was neither time nor reward for faculty to individualize instruction.

As a result, students consistently perceived the IEP as requiring additional rather than differentiated objectives. Toward the end of the eighteen-month program, most students had accepted the reality of the situation and had reverted largely, in some cases entirely, to the traditional mode of attending class each week, preparing for traditional tests, and developing products typifying conventional university requirements.

At the same time, professors grappled with extending opportunities for the Danforth Scholars without compromising their obligation to deliver traditional course content. In a sense, the dilemma became more difficult for faculty, especially those who strongly supported the theoretical basis for developing IEP's for students of exceptional potential. Faculty interviews revealed that professors made a diligent effort to satisfy commitments in both directions, but they simply did not have adequate tools for bridging the gap.

Non-traditional Course Opportunities.

The program allowed students a great deal of latitude in choosing their own methods of meeting course objectives. Professors, in turn, were to collaborate in matching student-selected experiences with established course expectations; they were also to monitor and evaluate these experiences. Program facilitators continually stressed the importance of each student's sharing control of the curriculum.

Objectives. Planning focused primarily on two tasks: 1) precisely defining entry-level skills, abilities, and learning needs; and 2) identifying areas of the required courses that needed modification to meet individual needs. Early in the program, facilitators conducted a brainstorming session in which students identified and prioritized learning needs they felt most pressing (based largely on results of the diagnostic assessments). Special workshops and seminars were scheduled to address needs identified as highest priorities, and Scholars were expected to participate in all of these planned activities. Six major content areas were selected for group study: 1) Interpersonal Process Recall, 2) Facilitating Group Functions, 3) Supervision, 4) Curriculum, 5) Change - Innovation, and 6) Politics. In addition, they could identify other learning opportunities, including seminars and intern experiences, that could substitute for regular class activities .

Outcomes. Personalizing instruction for the Danforth Scholars required professors to modify their usual delivery of course content rather drastically. Had they been able to make adjustments for entire classes, the faculty might have found the task less difficult. However, many of these changes meant substituting experiences available only to students in the program. That left professors to manage parallel learning experiences, not only proceeding with their own plans for instruction but also facing two additional tasks. First they had to determine the appropriateness of proposed substitutions; personal commitment to the content of their respective courses made that understandably difficult for many faculty members. In addition, when they did approve substitutions, they then faced the task of monitoring parallel programs within the enrollment of one class. The number of additional responsibilities depended on the number of Danforth Scholars enrolled in the course. Therefore, they found themselves in the position of making concessions that they might consider questionable and then assuming responsibility

for meeting their usual instructional objectives as well as assessing approved activities, some of which were fairly remote from their classrooms.

At the same time, Danforth Scholars were also experiencing a disruption of established beliefs about their roles and responsibilities as graduate students, partially in terms of their relationships with university professors. Student interview data reveal strong reservations about the whole notion of negotiating with faculty members, about requesting substitutions that professors might view as an "easy way out." In fact, only one student expressed any degree of comfort with these negotiations. The others felt uneasy, even presumptuous, in proposing that faculty members accept their individual plans as substitutes for what was required of other students. Therefore, what appeared to be a rather simple modification of regular procedures may actually have created a substantial inner conflict for both students and professors.

Mentor Relationships.

Each Scholar was assigned three mentors for the duration of the program. One was a field mentor selected by the district for outstanding leadership skills in the principalship; the other two were university mentors on the ELCS faculty, one each from the Administration/Supervision (ADSU) and Cultural Studies (CUST) Program Areas.

Objectives. The triad was designed to promote personalized programs that would reflect collaborative integration of practice and theory. University mentors from the Cultural Studies Program Area were included to ensure a cultural dimension in the curriculum. In addition to the primary field mentors (Type I) , facilitators recruited district administrators to serve only in an instructional resource capacity (Type II), making topical presentations and tutoring Scholars in areas of specialization. All mentors were invited to receive early training on effective strategies for guiding and supporting protégés.

Outcomes. Students assessed their mentorship relationships very differently, depending on personalities and compatibility of working styles. Those who experienced a "good fit" perceived enormous personal benefits from the arrangement. Others perceived the relationship more as a logistic requirement with little personal impact. In some cases, field mentors were heavily involved in planning, execution, and reflective assessment of experiential learning activities. In others, mentors acted more as inspectors than as teachers. This may have resulted simply from personality variation, or it may have resulted from undiscerned pressures being felt by the mentor. To form any conclusions about that would require further investigation.

Field mentors who participated actively in the program expressed a genuine commitment to the concept, remarking that in retrospect, they themselves would have gained a great deal from access to such a teacher. The two mentors interviewed for this study expressed great concern for the direction that leadership preparation had been taking, and they considered their role in the PREP program as both a rare opportunity to make a difference and a heavy responsibility for their protégés' growth and development.

Participation of Type II mentors appeared extremely isolated, in fact, almost imperceptible. A similar phenomenon occurred with the CUST co-mentor at the university level. A small number of co-mentors assumed an active role in planning for students, but in most cases the role of the co-mentor virtually dissolved early in the program. In fact, some students were not even aware that they had been assigned a co-mentor. Again, determining reasons for this development would require further study.

Cohort Relationships.

One of the overarching goals of the program was to establish a cohort of students bonded by common goals, interests, and experiences. Facilitators hoped

to build both a comaraderie among Scholars during their graduate studies and a network of assistance and support that would continue to grow after they entered the field as practicing administrators

Objectives. Program guidelines stipulated that Scholars meet as a group frequently throughout the program. The meetings were intended to provide not only a forum for exchanging ideas but a tangible support system as students broke new ground with their course work. The meetings could also reinforce the value of collegiality, an organizational element prized by effective school administrators.

Outcomes. Students who completed the program unanimously perceived the development of cohort relationships as a highlight of the program, perhaps even the greatest source of support throughout their experiences. As noted earlier, the original intent of identifying students with no experience did not materialize because so many districts selected students for Track II (students who had already entered graduate studies for principal certification).

That compromise affected the early months of cohort affiliation, in that students could not be placed automatically into introductory courses as a group, a major advantage of effective cohorts. Nevertheless, the group gradually developed a genuine bond that in some cases still continues. A number of students indicated that the cohort group became a kind of refuge for examining issues that they were all confronting in some way. This bond also extended to include the facilitators, who remained in close touch with the cohort group outside of structured activities as well as within the framework of formal program offerings. Many students feel confident that program facilitators would still be ready to assist them not only in educational and professional matters, but in more personal areas as well.

Emphasis on Experiential Learning.

Although pertinent theory provided the foundation for all phases of the curriculum, professors were asked to encourage Scholars to achieve as many

learning objectives as possible through field experience and to integrate that experience with appropriate theories from course work. More specifically, the curriculum emphasized experiences aimed at enhancing understanding rather than perpetuating the status quo.

Objectives. Mentors guided the majority of field experiences in actual campus practice. In addition, facilitators provided various seminars and projects to extend the experiential component. Reflection on theory and practice was intended to produce questions that might spark new visions, encourage rebuilding, restructuring, redesign. It also served as the primary vehicle for *integrating* theory and practice.

Outcomes. Students identified four structured learning experiences that they considered particularly valuable. The first was Interpersonal Process Recall, an intensive interactive experience that requires participants "to study their own interpersonal behavior and develop skills of their own choosing" (Kagan, p. 229). Most students indicated that this seminar had influenced their growth more than any other process-centered experience in the program. The cohort also participated in three product-centered projects that truly embodied on-the-job training. The first was a team evaluation of a local district high school based on Effective Schools Research. The team used an evaluation model developed for the Texas Education Agency (Norris, et al, 1987). The second was a presentation the cohort made at the national conference of DPPSP programs at the University of Oklahoma. PREP students prepared the presentation in small groups, each assuming responsibility for one segment of the content. The third project entitled "Quality ISD," consisted of a comprehensive proposal for funding and implementing educational programs for an ideal, hypothetical school district. Danforth Scholars were responsible for preparing first drafts of proposals, which were eventually presented to the Texas School Finance Symposium, a state organization of representatives from school

districts and professional organizations that had recently been established as a problem-solving forum for addressing issues of funding public schools in the state. All of these projects occurred in the spring of 1989.

Danforth Scholars agreed that these three activities were probably the most meaningful and growth-producing of all their program experiences. Scholars felt that these experiences more nearly simulated certain leadership challenges facing the principal than any other activities in which they participated. In the case of the Oklahoma conference, it was also the first time most of the students had received an opportunity to share ideas with fellow Danforth Scholars from other universities and professionals from other parts of the country; and it was extremely enlightening for all of them.

Application of adult learning theory.

The PREP curriculum design was based partially on assumptions regarding the unique needs of adult learners (Knowles, 1980).

Objectives. The entire IEP process addressed an adult's need for learning experiences that are self-directed, problem-centered, experiential, and role-related. Guiding students to engage in problem finding, not just problem solving, became an important element of this focus.

Outcomes. Findings included many student perceptions that supported inferences related to theoretical characteristics of adult learners. Though none of the interview questions deliberately targeted the tenets of adult learning theory, certain qualities outlined in that literature emerged quite distinctly as a number of students described their own learning needs and preferences. It seems logical to infer, therefore, that the basic principles of adult learning (included in the program's theoretical framework) had a definite impact on active student engagement in the differentiated learning experiences.

Curriculum Design

The theoretical focus of the program, visionary leadership, directed at least as much attention to development of the person as to development of skills or acquisition of knowledge. Therefore, the curriculum design promoted holistic thinking, conceptual approaches to leadership issues, self-understanding, and self-renewal. The University of Houston program sought to link theory and experience to form a knowledge base; but the knowledge base was constantly questioned during reflection. Thus the program extended far beyond learning about practice. It became, in a sense, a critique of practice -- an effort to develop students' skills as problem finders as well as problem solvers.

The need to improve preparation programs draws support from every arena of the educational community. Reformers generally agree that improvements must address the expanding dimensions of the principal's role, particularly with the recent focus on site-based management. Professional literature abounds with descriptions of the type of vision that characterizes successful school leadership. Practitioners are seeking programs that offer more opportunities for experiential learning and less emphasis on theoretical knowledge. University faculties also extol the value of learning experiences grounded in the field, e.g., internships, simulations, greater interaction with practicing school administrators, provided that sound theory undergirds such practices and that it serves as the backdrop for reflection on the experiences. Even so, implementing such dramatic change in any long-held tradition often brings about unexpected reactions and behaviors. Altering graduate course requirements and logistics for principal certification proved no exception at the University of Houston.

Program facilitators faced the difficulty of designing a program to promote leaders who will be agents for change in a situation heavily tied to state structures and mandates, for both universities and local districts. In addition, facilitators needed the aid and support of faculty colleagues entrenched in traditional

university approaches. Adapting to more open-ended procedures and methods stimulated diverse responses not only from the university faculty, but also from school district administrators and from individual candidates for certification. These four constraints, state mandates, organizational structure of the university, organizational structure of the school districts, and personalities of participants, represented key areas of inquiry in the historical reconstruction of the participants' experience.

Summary of Findings

Interview responses indicated that all informants in the study supported, to some degree, the program philosophy and goals. Members of the steering committee expressed enthusiasm about the fact that a major research university such as the University of Houston had decided to embark on this type of field-oriented experiment. Candidates and field mentors also viewed the program as a rare opportunity for students to acquire principal certification through field-based, experiential learning. Professors in the ELCS Department shared this enthusiasm for the ideal but revealed some skepticism about the possibility of carrying out their program roles at the same time that they fulfilled their regular responsibilities in the parallel program of traditional course work.

Certain constraints encumbered program operation to various degrees, according to participants' roles. However, many problems related in some way to two major issues: time and commitment. The University of Houston accepted the grant in October of 1987, agreeing to begin implementation the following spring. Therefore, facilitators found themselves in the all-too-common predicament of simultaneous planning and implementation. Faculty members revealed various levels of commitment to the program, but nearly all professors apparently believed from the beginning that program demands exceeded department resources, especially in regard to the time required for proper coordination of efforts.

Professors also struggled to incorporate self-paced learning (which was to be largely field-based) into the framework of traditional semester credit hours. At the same time, three of the collaborating school districts failed to meet their initial commitment to provide released time for candidates to participate in key program activities, including field experiences and seminars. These constraints created some degree of anxiety or frustration for Danforth Scholars, apparently influencing two students to withdraw before program completion.

Personal philosophies wielded an equally strong influence on the way the program "played out." Even professors who expressed strong support of PREP program goals were apparently, and understandably, more committed to their own teaching philosophies and styles. In addition, with so little time to negotiate details, course work began with little communication about students' earning course credit outside the parameters of traditional attendance requirements. Candidates also varied in their levels of commitment, motivation, and ability to direct their own learning experiences.

Perhaps the most intriguing data centered on the way participants viewed issues and events during implementation as compared to the way they viewed them in retrospect two years later. Expectations were often in conflict, especially in terms of what Danforth Scholars anticipated from professors and vice-versa. Again, time was short, and these perceptions were not articulated until the program was well underway. Equally striking differences in expectations emerged among perceptions of the mentorship, both from mentors and from protégés. The most consistent perceptions were expressed by Scholars about the cohort group, which they all identified as a major support system during their Danforth Experience. All participants left the experience with a firm belief that the program was "not for everybody." However, there was equally firm agreement, especially among Danforth Scholars, that this type of opportunity should be available to students

who learn best in an open environment that accommodates more self-direction than afforded by traditional graduate programs. Despite the obstacles they faced, all students who completed the program now view it as a highlight of their careers, and in some cases, a genuinely life-changing experience.

Recommendations

The PREP Program joined many such experiments across the country to test new strategies for developing visionary leadership. Findings of the present investigation suggest several possibilities for building on this pilot effort to advance the improvement of university preparation programs, which hold primary responsibility for certifying school administrators.

Policy

To institutionalize any innovation of this magnitude will require major policy changes at every level of educational governance. The following suggestions represent minimal steps that should be considered by each agent in the change process.

Legislature. Before any educational agency can realistically consider modifying current policies and procedures for licensing administrators, state legislatures should take the initiative to support major reforms with adequate funding Without appropriate financial commitment from state government, such efforts cannot fully succeed.

State Education Agencies. Commissioners of Education should modify rules and regulations so that recommendations for certification are not credit-driven, but competency-driven. In most states, this would require that current policies and procedures be completely re-structured.

Coordinating Boards. Even with strong support at the state level, universities face the problem of delivering differentiated programs within the framework of the conventional credit-hour system. Flexibility to deal with that

issue must emanate from the Coordinating Board's approval of departures from the conventional system.

Universities. University presidents make the final decisions in allocating funds received from the state. Therefore, these chief administrators must not only understand the program but also ensure adequate resources to meet the needs of students they want to place in the program. In addition, the university must commit to rewarding professors whose efforts center on field experiences, as well as those who are dedicated to scholarly research.

Colleges of Education. The administration at the college level must make a similar commitment to follow through with allocation of resources within the college. Decision-makers must understand, value, and support the effort in every possible way.

Departments of Educational Administration. Faculty members must recognize the value of field experience, and in so doing, must review their own curriculum requirements to reflect the changing needs of students of educational administration.

Local School Districts. Superintendents must not only demonstrate a willingness to collaborate in the design and delivery but must also reward administrative staff in various ways for creating field-based opportunities for administrator candidates. In addition, they must provide adequate released time for students to participate in field experiences; otherwise, the field component will not materialize.

Advance Planning

Numerous issues arising in the University of Houston experience related either directly or indirectly to the pressures for quick implementation. This would imply that future innovative efforts might begin with a substantial block of time to plan. Perhaps even eighteen months would not be an unreasonable suggestion, for

more than one reason. Most obviously, it would provide adequate time to refine a plan before implementing it. In addition, it would allow time for key participants, especially district administrators and university faculty, to develop a stronger sense of collaboration and commitment to the program.

The Cohort

Interview data clearly depicted the cohort group as a key source of learning and support for the Danforth Scholars. This is one of the few innovations of the program that could be institutionalized with minimal renovation of the traditional program. In fact, the ELCS Department has already initiated efforts in that direction for students entering graduate studies in Administration and Supervision. There is growing national interest in the concept at the doctoral level, which might represent an even more important need to provide a structure for mutual student support.

Integrating Innovation with Tradition

It would certainly be possible to integrate other specific program components into a traditional framework of graduate courses. For instance, interested faculty could design alternative plans, e.g., contracts for learning, within any traditional course. The level of personalization and departure from the usual requirements could then be directed entirely by the professor's own values regarding course content. Such a mixture of approaches would address a number of instructional issues that inevitably emerge in the effort to operate an individualized program concurrently with traditional courses The decision to offer these types of alternatives might require considerable courage on the part of individual faculty members, depending on the level of autonomy perceived within a department.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of this eclectic approach would be that it does not deny students an opportunity to benefit from the wealth of experience and

wisdom professors have to offer. Several Danforth Scholars remarked that one motive for attending regular classes was that they did not wish to miss that opportunity. The effort to accommodate adult learners' needs for self-direction should not preclude valuable contributions to the learning process that professors can make by virtue of their own expertise.

A "School-within-a-School" Approach

In executing the adopted curriculum plan for Danforth Scholars, professors expressed notable difficulty in attempting to accommodate the IEP's at the same time that they met responsibilities for their regular course load. Responses from both faculty and students indicate that this type of program may suit only an unknown percentage of people. Therefore, implementation of the total concept might best be accomplished in a situation where all participants, even faculty, may choose between this approach and the more traditional process. One way to achieve this would be to create a "school-within-a-school," relegating the personalized program to students and professors who have a genuine interest in such an arrangement. The obvious difficulty, of course, is that of differentiated staffing to direct separate but parallel programs.

Personalization

The PREP Program may have borne more resemblance to an exercise in Human Resource Development than to matriculation through conventional graduate studies. In a fundamental sense, leadership itself might be viewed as the practice of self- assertion, a holistic way of tapping all the qualities of Self to achieve goals in concert with others. Self-paced, self- directed, emphasizing self-awareness, reflection, and renewal, this program offered innumerable opportunities for students to acquire a deeper understanding of their own unique beliefs, abilities, styles, behaviors, and areas for growth -- all of which shape the impact of a leader.

More importantly, it challenged them to activate what they learned toward a new vision of school leadership.

Results of this study suggest powerful implications for the focus on personal development -- the most complex of all change -- as a key to training effective administrators. The PREP Program represents certain universal dynamics of change, regardless of context. Change occurs only when individuals take a firm position that initiates action. Expecting prospective administrators to assume a position of organizational power without fully exploring the personal powers at their command may be presumptuous. Therefore, policy-makers might do well to consider institutionalizing proven strategies that promote thorough awareness of Self as a prerequisite to, or at least an integral part of, developing leadership skills.

Evaluation

Before any key elements are replicated, or even emulated, they should be carefully assessed and analyzed. Reports like *Taking Stock...* (Cordeiro et al, 1992) and studies such as this one could provide invaluable data for analysis. However, it would seem important to extend research by conducting a thorough investigation of each discrete component, e.g., selection, mentorship, curriculum, etc. Murphy (1990) points out that various agencies have invested large sums of money in reform strategies based purely on beliefs and "hunches," with little visible concern for evaluating the effectiveness of such strategies after they are tested. Perhaps educators should heed this observation by taking a stand for more regular assessment and feedback for improvement efforts. The same holds true for evaluation during an improvement effort; formative evaluation could reduce the impact of issues that otherwise may not be communicated early enough to prevent serious difficulties.

Further Research

Data collected for this investigation contain endless ideas for further research. A number of them lie simply in deeper analysis of these findings. The suggestions below enumerate a few other key possibilities inferred by the investigator.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

In his recommendations for improving educational administration programs, Murphy (1990) observes the need for more attention to real cost vs. direct cost, i.e., dollar expenditures. He refers to real cost as including time, motivation, commitment, richness of curriculum, and other welfare gains and losses. These issues represent a large number of costs and benefits articulated by participants of the PREP Program. Data from this study alone could build a substantial case for providing additional monetary support for reform efforts. However, adequate funding will not likely occur without a great deal of additional research.

Power and Authority

Today's educational community is experiencing fundamental shifts in relationships among levels of school governance, changes in distinction of boundaries, etc. In the case of professional preparation programs, a key issue is the lack of control universities have over the content and delivery of administrator training. It seems imperative that leaders in all of these camps explore ways to share authority and influence among professionals, to consider more effective ways of delegating authority and power to agencies directly responsible for delivery of various services.

Collaboration

Most current reform advocates strongly question the apparent lack of collaboration between groups and agencies with a vested interest in the outcomes of educational programs at every level. True collaboration is far more complex than mutual agreement on a plan; it requires a tangible investment by everyone

involved. Universities need to explore ways of rewarding faculty for such an investment, just as school districts need to reward administrators who contribute to the effort.

Leadership and Personal Profiles

The assessments used to diagnose learning needs of the Danforth Scholars yielded an extensive body of data about their individual beliefs, abilities, styles, and preferences. These data could, and should, be further analyzed to seek correlation between individual personality types and numerous aspects of leadership training. Such studies could be particularly valuable for exploring relationships between the data and the students' performance in the program, their perceptions of experiences during the program, their performance in current positions of leadership, and their career goals, just to name a few.

Adult Learning Theory

Few studies cited in the professional literature have examined learning characteristics of students in educational administration programs, or any other educational specialization, to seek patterns of learning preferences that may be unique to adult learners. The whole notion of learning characteristics peculiar to adults should be studied carefully to provide empirical evidence of whether or not such traits do indeed even exist and, if they do, how preparation programs might best accommodate them.

The Mentor/Protégé Relationship

Professional literature suggests many techniques for a mentor's effective guidance of a protégé. However, one of the most intriguing notions was presented by an ELCS professor in the initial seminar for Field Mentors, i.e., planning the intern experience in distinct stages as a framework for incremental development of leadership skills. It would seem fruitful to conduct an experimental study that compares such a process with a traditional product-oriented internship experience.

Summation

I opened this presentation with a legend from the distant past. At the risk of mixing metaphors, I wish to close with another anecdote -- one that many of you have probably heard before -- from more recent times but of unknown origin. A policeman was walking his beat one evening when he noticed an unfamiliar, slightly inebriated gentleman on his hands and knees, intently looking through the grass around a lamppost. When the policeman asked what he was doing, the man replied, "I dropped a quarter." Wishing to help, the officer asked him exactly where he had been standing when the coin fell out of his hands. The stranger raised his head, pointed down the street, and said, "On that corner." Then he bent over to continue his search. Taken aback, the policeman asked why he was searching here, if he dropped the coin a block away. The gentleman looked a bit puzzled as he slurred, "Anyone can see there's no light down there."

As reform advocates continue to press for more effective principal preparation programs, responsible educators continue -- in good faith -- to seek and eliminate flaws in existing practices of administrator certification. Might we be pouring our energies and resources into a search under the lamppost? Granted, the light surrounding self-knowledge glows less brightly than that illuminating structured manipulation of objective, generally accepted content, processes, and structures. Conventional terrain poses far less threat, uncertainty, complexity. But what if it doesn't hold the answers? Is it possible that the elusive coin lies on a different corner? Might that corner, however dimly lit, comprise the intricacies of human character, personality, disposition? If we concede even a remote possibility of that, we have little choice but to consider venturing beyond the light.

REFERENCES

Bernard, H. R. (1988). Research methods in cultural anthropology. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement -- Schools can make a difference. Brookly, NY: Praeger.

Carspecken, P. F. & Apple, M. (1992). Critical qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice. In Lecompte, M., Millroy, W., & Preissle, J., eds., The handbook of qualitative research in education. San Diego: Academic Press.

Clark, T. A., Lotto, L. S., & McCarthy, M. M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 61(3), 467-70.

Cordeiro, P. A., Krueger, J. A., Parks, D., Restine, N. L., & Wilson, P. (n.d.). Taking stock: A report on the Danforth programs for the preparation of school principals. Unpublished manuscript.

Danforth Foundation (June 1986). The Danforth program for the preparation of school principals.

Edmonds, R., & Frederiksen, N. (1978). Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children. Cambridge: Harvard University, Center for Urban Studies.

Education Commission of the States. (1983). Action for excellence. In J. Murphy, ed., The educational reform movement of the 1980's: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gresso, D. W. (n.d.). Initiation of the principal preparation program for the Danforth Foundation: Information for a case study. Unpublished manuscript.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration. (Occasional Paper No. 8312).

Griffiths, D., Stout, R., & Forsyth, P. (Eds.). (1988). Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kagan, N. (1984). Interpersonal process recall: Basic methods and recent research. In Larsen, D., ed., Teaching psychological skills. Monterrey, CA: Brooks Cole.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy (2nd edition). New York: Cambridge Books.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCracken, G. (1988). The long interview. Newbury Park: Sage.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980's: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Norris, C. J., Macaluso, L., & Weise, K. (1987). Beyond horizons of excellence: Texas Campus Effectiveness Model. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency

Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 31-34.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

U.S. Department of Education. (1987). Principal selection guide. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. In J. Murphy, ed., The educational reform movement of the 1980's: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Weise, K. R. (1992). A contemporary historical study of the Danforth Program for Preparation of School Principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

APPENDIX

PRINCIPAL'S REFLECTIVE, EXPERIENTIAL PREPARATION (PREP) PROGRAM

PHILOSOPHY

The faculty of the University of Houston and collaborating school districts are committed to identifying and implementing improved practices in the preparation of principals. The Principal's Reflective, Experiential Preparation (PREP) Program responds both to society's changing expectations of the school principal and to the learning needs of the candidates aspiring to that role. Designed in the same spirit of change and improvement that has driven current educational reform, the PREP Program provides a framework for immersing students in reflective, experiential learning which will prepare them to meet the complex challenge of the principalship in today's schools.

In recent years, the educational community has embarked on the most extensive reform effort in the history of public schools. As a result of diverse expectations and new demands that society is placing on schools, principals face a new and challenging array of complex issues. Current state legislation , stringent accountability procedures, and the proliferation of regulations governing schools require principals to possess knowledge and skills in leadership beyond that which was needed even a decade ago. Recent research on practices of effective schools reinforces the need for strong leadership by school principals. Studies have consistently revealed that schools which effect substantial improvement in student achievement are led by principals who articulate a new vision, who synthesize organizational purposes from a holistic perspective, and who provide the voice to give direction to the vision.

This focus on a new breed of campus leaders and on the importance of developing broader perspectives of instructional leadership has prompted universities to seek methods of preparation which maximize individual students' potential for acquiring the knowledge and skills to succeed in the demanding role of the principal. These methods should reflect the basic principles of adult learning theory, which are based on the following assumptions about unique needs of adult learners:

- Adults' self-concept requires that they be perceived as self- directing; therefore, they need increasing opportunities to direct their own learning.
- Adults' orientation to learning tends to be problem-centered rather than subject-centered
- Adults have developed a rich reservoir of experiences which lead them to prefer less teacher transmittal of knowledge and more experiential learning opportunities (field experience, team projects, etc.).

- Adults' readiness to learn depends far more on the demands of their professional roles than on academic pressure.

These assumptions provide an exciting foundation for building a curriculum which can indeed guide the development of principals well-prepared for the task of leading schools to excellence.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The UH-LEA-Danforth Consortium has been established to design an alternative program for principal certification for selected students. Governance of the project is truly collaborative. The PREP Board of Directors was formed to include the superintendents (or designees) of the fifteen participating school districts and all of the faculty members of the Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies (ELCS). The Board of Directors then created a steering committee composed of five school district administrators and four faculty members. The Steering Committee formulates policy recommendations, and the Board of Directors sets policy. Two ELCS faculty members co-facilitate the development and implementation of the PREP Program.

This pilot program marks a dramatic departure from the current certification program, which requires a given number of semester credit hours of traditional, predominantly lecture-oriented coursework. Students participating in this program will receive University credit and Mid-management certification; however, the curriculum will consist substantially of reflective, field-based administrative experience as specified in an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) designed for each student. Additional curriculum will be addressed as much as possible through other types of experiential learning, e.g., laboratories, simulations, etc. Each IEP will contain specific competencies identified through extensive diagnostic/prescriptive assessment by the University. Learning experiences will be self-paced, allowing students to complete requirements at any time within the two-year period.

Students must be nominated by the school districts and approved by the Steering Committee. Each student will be matched with at least one Mentor who is recognized as an outstanding practicing administrator and with a University professor whose expertise lies in the curriculum areas noted as needs in the IEP. Both students and Mentors will have access to numerous professional development activities led by nationally recognized consultants in the field of educational administration.

STUDENT SELECTION

CRITERIA

School distrticts are encouraged to select candidates for participation in the program who meet the entry requirements for admission to the University of Houston (see attached). Candidates should possess strong potential for outstanding administrative leadership as exhibited by the following characteristics:

Creative, Risk Taker, Innovative - Generates and recognizes innovative solutions in work-related situations. Exhibits openness to new ideas from others; demonstrates originality in developing policies and procedures.

Educational Values - Possesses a well-reasoned educational philisophy; receptive to new ideas and change; and is interested in students. Sets high performance goals and standards for self, subordinates, students, and the organization and is dissatisfied with average performance. Has a clear perspective of the role of education in society.

Instructional Leadership, Classroom Supervision - Understands the instructional process and is well-versed in a variety of instructional techniques. Is able to evaluate classroom instruction relative to teacher objectives and student performance and is able to work effectively with teachers to improve instruction.

Leadership - Involves others in solving problems; recognizes when a group requires direction; interacts with groups effectively; sets goals and guides others to accomplish tasks; utilizes appropriate interpersonal styles; and performs consistently over time.

Oral & Written Communication - Clearly presents facts and ideas both orally and in writing; communication is both precise and concise; uses language that is appropriate to the person or group.

Organizational Ability - Plans and schedules the work of others; optimally uses resources; schedules own time and work effectively; when planning, considers constraints such as societal and governmental factors.

Personal Motivation, Energy, Ambition - Actively attempts to influence events to achieve goals; considers work important to personal satisfaction; evaluates own work. Initiates activities rather than merely reacts to situations; takes action beyond minimal requirements. Maintains a high energy level. Consistently follows through on assigned tasks. Develops and follows professional growth plans for self.

Personality, Charisma, Impact, Projection - Makes a positive impact in all types of situations. Has a sense of vision and is able to project that sense. Has ability to be a teacher, trainer, coach, and cheerleader. Exhibits confidence in self.

Problem Analysis - Seeks and analyzes relevant and complex information to determine the important elements of a problem; uses information to distinguish significance of problems; uses appropriate decision-making processes.

Sensitivity, Human Relations Competence - Perceives the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; resolves conflicts; tactfully deals with individuals from varying backgrounds; effectively deals with people and emotional issues; knows which information to share and with whom.

In addition to the characteristics above, the following criteria will be used to select students for a two-track program:

Track I - Students should not have more than twelve (12) semester credit hours of coursework in educational administration and should not have had administrative experience in the public schools;

Track II - Students should have at least twelve (12) semester credit hours of coursework in educational administration and should have no more than two years of administrative experience. A student in Track II should also be willing to pursue a minimum of thirty (30) semester credit hours of coursework related to the doctoral program in administration and supervision and/or to mid-management, supervision, or superintendent certification.

PROCEDURES

Students in Track I and/or Track II will be selected by participating school districts. The Steering Committee reserves the right of final review of all candidates. Alternates should be selected for each student nominated in the event that a particular student does not pass Steering Committee Review. Districts are requested to submit the following data for each student selected:

1. Application for admission to the University of Houston
2. Personal resume`
3. Autobiography of the Future (format attached).

Selected students will routinely be initially admitted to the University on a Post- Baccalaureate basis. After formal testing, i.e., GRE or Miller Analogies Test, the students will be admitted through regular University procedures. The University provides flexibility in admissions by allowing each faculty member to sponsor one student with demonstrated potential who does not meet all standard criteria. Formal program implementation will begin in September.

MENTOR SELECTION
CRITERIA

The program will include two types of Mentors:

Type I - Career Development and Instructional Resource Personnel

The same general criteria being utilized for student selection (see p. 1) shall be used in the selection of Type I Mentors. In addition, Type I Mentors should have achieved the following:

1. a minimum of two (2) years of outstanding building-based adminis-trative experience (MAY CURRENTLY BE CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL);

2. a record of demonstrating exceptional counseling skills; and
3. an exemplary history of investing oneself in the growth and development of employees.

Type II -Instructional Resource Only (tutorial and large group)

Type II Mentors should have the following characteristics:

1. will be recognized by their peers as having exceptional expertise in one or more areas of skill and knowledge necessary for exceptionalperformance as a principal;
2. will have demonstrated that they can teach what they know; and
3. will have demonstrated a willingness to contribute to the professional development of others

PROCEDURES

Collaborating school districts will designate at least one Type I Mentor for each student recommended for the program. The districts may make available additional Type I personnel. Districts are encouraged to nominate Type I Mentors even if they do not nominate students for the program. They are also encouraged to nominate more than the minimum number of Type I Mentors so that students will have access to experiences at all levels of administration and in diverse socio-economic, multi-cultural settings. Type II Mentors will be identified by collaborating school districts as they deem appropriate. The superintendent or his/her designee will provide a **cover letter** presenting the merits of each Type I and Type II Mentor and a **resume`** for each.

DISTRICT ALLOTMENT OF STUDENTS

Initially, each collaborating district will be allotted two student slots (one in each Track), for which the district will make a firm commitment. Districts choosing not to fill both slots will notify one of the University Co-facilitators so that those slots may be offered to other participating districts.

TIME FOR STUDENT ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Districts will have four options for providing time for student administrative experience:

1. 1/2-day teaching, 1/2-day administration for a full regular school year;
2. 1/2-day teaching, 1/2-day administration for one semester during the regular school year plus forty-five (45) summer days;
3. one day per week plus nine (9) additional days during the regular school year plus forty-five (45) summer days; or
4. one full semester (90 days) during the regular school year.

The Steering Committee recommends Option #4 for optimum benefit. Districts should indicate which option(s) they choose when they give notification of intent to participate.

Creative, Risk Taker, Innovative - Generates and recognizes innovative solutions in work-related situations. Exhibits openness to new ideas from others; demonstrates originality in developing policies and procedures.

Educational Values - Possesses a well-reasoned educational philisophy; receptive to new ideas and change; and is interested in students. Sets high performance goals and standards for self, subordinates, students, and the organization and is dissatisfied with average performance. Has a clear perspective of the role of education in society.

Instructional Leadership, Classroom Supervision - Understands the instructional process and is well-versed in a variety of instructional techniques. Is able to evaluate classroom instruction relative to teacher objectives and student performance and is able to work effectively with teachers to improve instruction.

Leadership - Involves others in solving problems; recognizes when a group requires direction; interacts with groups effectively; sets goals and guides others to accomplish tasks; utilizes appropriate interpersonal styles; and performs consistently over time.

Oral & Written Communication - Clearly presents facts and ideas both orally and in writing; communication is both precise and concise; uses language that is appropriate to the person or group.

Organizational Ability - Plans and schedules the work of others; optimally uses resources; schedules own time and work effectively; when planning, considers constraints such as societal and governmental factors.

Personal Motivation, Energy, Ambition - Actively attempts to influence events to achieve goals; considers work important to personal satisfaction; evaluates own work. Initiates activities rather than merely reacts to situations; takes action beyond minimal requirements. Maintains a high energy level. Consistently follows through on assigned tasks. Develops and follows professional growth plans for self.

Personality, Charisma, Impact, Projection - Makes a positive impact in all types of situations. Has a sense of vision and is able to project that sense. Has ability to be a teacher, trainer, coach, and cheerleader. Exhibits confidence in self.

Problem Analysis - Seeks and analyzes relevant and complex information to determine the important elements of a problem; uses information to distinguish significance of problems; uses appropriate decision-making processes.

Sensitivity, Human Relations Competence - Perceives the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; resolves conflicts; tactfully deals with individuals from varying backgrounds; effectively deals with people and emotional issues; knows which information to share and with whom.

In addition to the characteristics above, the following criteria will be used to select students for a two-track program:

Track I - Students should not have more than twelve (12) semester credit hours of coursework in educational administration and should not have had administrative experience in the public schools;

Track II - Students should have at least twelve (12) semester credit hours of coursework in educational administration and should have no more than two years of administrative experience. A student in Track II should also be willing to pursue a minimum of thirty (30) semester credit hours of coursework related to the doctoral program in administration and supervision and/or to mid-management, supervision, or superintendent certification.

PROCEDURES

Students in Track I and/or Track II will be selected by participating school districts. The Steering Committee reserves the right of final review of all candidates. Alternates should be selected for each student nominated in the event that a particular student does not pass Steering Committee Review. Districts are requested to submit the following data for each student selected:

1. Application for admission to the University of Houston
2. Personal resume`
3. Autobiography of the Future (format attached).

Selected students will routinely be initially admitted to the University on a Post- Baccalaureate basis. After formal testing, i.e., GRE or Miller Analogies Test, the students will be admitted through regular University procedures. The University provides flexibility in admissions by allowing each faculty member to sponsor one student with demonstrated potential who does not meet all standard criteria. Formal program implementation will begin in September.

MENTOR SELECTION

CRITERIA

The program will include two types of Mentors:

Type I - Career Development and Instructional Resource Personnel

The same general criteria being utilized for student selection (see p. 1) shall be used in the selection of Type I Mentors. In addition, Type I Mentors should have achieved the following:

1. a minimum of two (2) years of outstanding building-based adminis-trative experience (MAY CURRENTLY BE CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL);

2. a record of demonstrating exceptional counseling skills; and
3. an exemplary history of investing oneself in the growth and development of employees.

Type II -Instructional Resource Only (tutorial and large group)

Type II Mentors should have the following characteristics:

1. will be recognized by their peers as having exceptional expertise in one or more areas of skill and knowledge necessary for exceptionalperformance as a principal;
2. will have demonstrated that they can teach what they know; and
3. will have demonstrated a willingness to contribute to the professional development of others

PROCEDURES

Collaborating school districts will designate at least one Type I Mentor for each student recommended for the program. The districts may make available additional Type I personnel. Districts are encouraged to nominate Type I Mentors even if they do not nominate students for the program. They are also encouraged to nominate more than the minimum number of Type I Mentors so that students will have access to experiences at all levels of administration and in diverse socio-economic, multi-cultural settings. Type II Mentors will be identified by collaborating school districts as they deem appropriate. The superintendent or his/her designee will provide a **cover letter** presenting the merits of each Type I and Type II Mentor and a **resume`** for each.

DISTRICT ALLOTMENT OF STUDENTS

Initially, each collaborating district will be allotted two student slots (one in each Track), for which the district will make a firm commitment. Districts choosing not to fill both slots will notify one of the University Co-facilitators so that those slots may be offered to other participating districts.

TIME FOR STUDENT ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Districts will have four options for providing time for student administrative experience:

1. 1/2-day teaching, 1/2-day administration for a full regular school year;
2. 1/2-day teaching, 1/2-day administration for one semester during the regular school year plus forty-five (45) summer days;
3. one day per week plus nine (9) additional days during the regular school year plus forty-five (45) summer days; or
4. one full semester (90 days) during the regular school year.

The Steering Committee recommends Option #4 for optimum benefit. Districts should indicate which option(s) they choose when they give notification of intent to participate.